



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/604,932	08/27/2003	Satoshi Kitamura	SIC-03-027	1931
29863	7590	01/09/2004	EXAMINER	
DELAND LAW OFFICE P.O. BOX 69 KLAMATH RIVER, CA 96050-0069			LUEBKE, RENEE S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/604,932	Applicant(s) KITAMURA & ICHIDA	
	Examiner Renee S. Luebke	Art Unit 2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 August 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>9/03</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2833

1. The drawings are objected to because reed switch 23 and power storage 38 appear to be mislabeled in Fig. 3 (see paragraphs 16 and 19, respectively). In addition, in Fig. 5, it appears that "80a" should be deleted, as it does not indicate a protrusion (see paragraph 29). Proposed drawing corrections or formal corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objections to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-5, 9-11, 13, 14 and 17-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fey, et al. in view of Nishimoto. The bicycle electrical control of Fey comprises control units, electrical signals and an electrical cord 22 substantially as claimed. It lacks detachable connectors, since there is no indication of how the cord is attached to the units. However, Nishimoto teaches the use of detachable connectors 14, 15. These connections fill a gap in the system of Fey and enable replacement of the various parts, instead of the entire system, when necessary. For this reason, it would have been obvious to use the detachable connections of Nishimoto on the cords of Fey. In regard to claims 17, 18, 20, 21 and 24 the type of connection is seen to have been an obvious matter of choice dependent upon the desired qualities of the inventive device (which are not detailed in the specification) and those of the known connectors.

4. Claims 2, 6-8, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fey and Nishimoto as applied to claims 1 and 3-5 above, and further in view of Roberts. The devices of Fey further fails to specify a power source for the device, although it is clearly needed. However, Roberts is an

Art Unit: 2833

example of the well-known use of a dynamo on a bicycle to supply power and, hence, signals to electrical devices thereon. Such an arrangement allows the user to supply the needed power and would, therefore, have been an obvious source of power on the bicycle electrical control of Fey.

5. Claim 12 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The devices of Kawakami and Fry are further examples of bicycle electrical control apparatuses similar to those of the present invention.

7. Any response to this action **may be mailed to:**

**Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Plaza 4, Fourth Floor (Receptionist)
2201 South Clark Place, Arlington, Virginia.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be directed to Mrs. Renee Luebke whose telephone number is (703) 308-1511.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mrs. Paula Bradley, can be reached at (703) 308-2319.



Renee S. Luebke
Primary Patent Examiner
January 2, 2004